R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 017 559 UD 004 377

KENTUCKY EVALUATION OF TITLE I PROJECTS, 1966.
KENTUCKY STATE DEPT. OF EDUCATION, FRANKFORT

PUB DATE 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.32 31P.

DESCRIPTORS- *FEDERAL PROGRAMS, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, *STATISTICAL DATA, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, *COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS, SCHOOL DISTRICTS, PRIVATE SCHOOLS, TABLES (DATA), DROPOUT RATE, INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION, SUMMER PROGRAMS, ACHIEVEMENT, ANNUAL REPORTS, PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION, MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS, STAFF UTILIZATION, SCHOOL SERVICES, ESEA TITLE 1, KENTUCKY

THE FIRST SECTION OF THIS EVALUATION REPORT PROVIDES INFORMATION ABOUT THE FOLLOWING PROJECT ACTIVITIES--(1) OPERATION AND SERVICES, (2) DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION, (3) EVALUATION, (4) MAJOR PROBLEMS, (5) IMPLEMENTATION OF SECTION 205 OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT, (6) COORDINATION WITH COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS, (7) INTERRELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER TITLES OF THE ACT, (8) COOPERATIVE PROJECTS BETWEEN LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS, AND (9) NONPUBLIC SCHOOL PARTICIPATION. THE SECOND SECTION DESCRIBES THE PROBLEMS OF THE LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES, THE EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN, FUNDED ACTIVITIES, MEASURING INSTRUMENTS, AND EFFECTIVE ACTIVITIES AND METHODS. IT ALSO PROVIDES STATISTICAL DATA ON PUPIL ENROLLMENT AND EXPENDITURES. THE FINAL SECTION CONSISTS OF TABULAR DATA ON THE FREQUENCY OF THE USE OF PARTICULAR MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS, PUPILS' WITHDRAWAL FROM THE PROJECTS, AND THE HIGHER EDUCATION OF PROJECT PARTICIPANTS. ADDITIONAL DATA IS PRESENTED ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE TITLE I AS MEASURED BY STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS AND ON THE DEGREE OF PROGRESS MADE AT EACH SCHOOL LEVEL. READING PROGRAMS WERE THE MOST PREVALENT TITLE I ACTIVITY, BUT PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND HEALTH, LANGUAGE ARTS, AND MATHEMATICS PROGRAMS WERE ALSO COMMON. OF THE 170 INSERVICE PROGRAMS WHICH WERE REPORTED, 132 WERE FOUND TO BE SUBSTANTIALLY BENEFICIAL. THE 167 SUMMER PROGRAMS HELPED STUDENTS TO MAKE SOME ACADEMIC PROGRESS. PROGRAMS OPERATING DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR REPORTED VERY LITTLE PROGRESS. (LB)

DOCUMENT FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED017559

UD 004 377

1966

EVALUATION OF TITLE I PROJECTS

KENTUCKY

Office of Evaluation

Bureau of Instruction

KENTUCKY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Harry M. Sparks
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Frankfort, Kentucky

KENTUCKY EVALUATION REPORT FOR 1966 TITLE I PROJECTS

PART I

1. OPERATION AND SERVICES

On November 10, 1965, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Dr. Harry M. Sparks, called a meeting in Louisville, Kentucky, for the purpose of acquainting the school officials of the State with the provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Practically 100% of the 200 school districts of the State sent representatives to this meeting. Superintendents, supervisors, and other central office personnel attended. Presentations were made by various members of the Department of Education concerning project development, evaluation, and other facets of the program.

Early in 1966, soon after funds were available, the Superintendent of Public Instruction called a state-wide meeting for superintendents of the local educational agencies to further discuss guidelines and the development of projects under Title I. Again, the personnel of the various school districts responded by excellent attendance. During this meeting much of the groundwork was laid for the development and implementation of projects. During the time between the funding of the Act and the June 30 deadline for commitment of funds, the staff of the Bureau of Instruction under the leadership of Mr. Don C. Bale, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction, and the staff of the Bureau of Administration and Finance under the leadership of Mr. James Melton, Assistant Superintendent for Administration and Finance, devoted much time and effort in assisting local school districts in the development of projects. These efforts were primarily centered in the office of the Coordinator of Title I, Mr. Fred Williams and the office of Mr. Claude A. Taylor, Director of the Division of Instructional Services. It was the function of the office of Mr. Williams to help districts develop project applications and to approve the fiscal feasibility of same. The Division of Instructional Services and other related Divisions concerned with programs and services were concerned primarily with a determination of the educational validity of the projects. Staff members concerned with both fiscal and educational problems, made multiple contacts with representatives of local educational agencies both on the LEA sites and in the state offices as well as telephone calls and correspondence.

On June 15, 1966, the position of Coordinator of Evaluation was established and Mr. Claude A. Taylor assumed these responsibilities.

During October 1966, five area meetings were held by the staff of the Director of Title I and the Coordinator of Evaluation in the Bureau of Instruction. Over 1,000 participants attended these meetings representing 95% of the total local educational agencies in the state. Attendance ranged from 105 participants to 250 in the meetings. These conferences provided opportunities for discussion of problems of project development and evaluation as well as the sharing of information and ideas available from the federal level.

Staff personnel in the Department of Education concerned with pupil personnel services, statistical services, and data processing are helping develop procedures for securing and storing critical data incident to Title I projects.

2. DISSEMINATION

(a) In many instances, local educational agencies are sharing data with other local educational agencies. This is being accomplished through area meetings of Title I Coordinators and Evaluators. Staff members from the Department of Education frequently meet with these area groups and problems and procedures are shared and discussed. Educational supervisors employed at the LEA level are organized in regional groups for sharing purposes and are utilizing the Coordinator of Evaluation and the Coordinator of Title I in many of these group activities.

(b) Over 90% of the school districts having Title I projects have filed evaluation reports with the Kentucky State Department of Education. Many of these reports are very excellent and reflect excellent leadership on the part of the school districts involved.

3. EVALUATION

(a) The guidelines provided by the U. S. Office (for information purposes only) during late April of 1966, with certain adjustments, were incorporated into the publication, "Evaluation, Procedures and Guidelines, Title I Projects, ESEA, 1965-66". This document was sent to each local district having Title I projects early in July 1966. Copies of this publication are attached.

(b) The following state personnel representing divisions and the staffs of same have provided assistance in Title I projects developed and evaluated by local educational agencies:

Mr. Don C. Bale, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction

Mr. Claude A. Taylor, Coordinator of Evaluation

Mr. Malcom McCulloch, Liason Officer with the Kentucky office of Economic Opportunity

Mr. D. C. Anderson, Director, Division of Instructional Services

Dr. Sidney Simandle, Director, Division of Teacher Education and Certification

Dr. Stella Edwards, Director, Division of Special Education

Mr. C. E. Bevins, Director, Division of School Lunch

Mr. James Melton, Assistant Superintendent for Administration and Finance

Dr. Kearney Campbell, Director, Division of Guidance Services

Mr. Paul Thurman, Director, Division of Buildings and Grounds

Mr. Arnold Guess, Director, Division of Statistical Services

Mr. Charles Bratton, Director of Computer Services

Mr. Lee Tyler, Director of Pupil Personnel Services

Mr. Louis Yandell, Director, Division of Pupil Transportation

Mr. J. M. Alsip, Director, Division of Finance

Mr. E. P. Hilton, Assistant Superintendent for Vocational Education

Mr. M. M. Botto, Director, Division of Agricultural Education

Miss Mary Lois Williamson, Director, Home Economics Education

Fred Martin, Director, Division of Trade and Industrial and Distributive Education

(c) U. S. Office personnel was the only agency providing assistance to the state.

(d)

Number of Projects	Evaluation Design
92	Two group experimental design using the project group and a conveniently available non-project group as the control.
59	One group design using a pretest and posttest on the project group to compare observed gains or losses with expected gains.
87	One group design using pretest and/or posttest scores on the project group to compare observed performance with local, State, or national groups.
127	One group design using test data on the project group to compare observed performance with expected performance based upon data for past years in the project school.
5	One group design using test data on the project group, but no comparison data.

4. MAJOR PROBLEM AREAS

(1) We have not encountered any major problems in reviewing proposals. Since ESEA is being administered as an integral part of the State Education Program, instructional personnel have been used to review the educational aspects of projects. For example, those projects having to do with programs for Special Education are referred to the Division of Special Education for review and approval. The fiscal approval of projects has worked very smoothly. When problems arising in a project could not otherwise be resolved, some were referred to a reviewing committee established for this purpose. Local Educational Agencies have the right of appeal to this committee and in several instances have availed themselves of this right. This committee is composed of Mr. Sam Alexander, Deputy Superintendent, Mr. Don C. Bale, Assistant Superintendent, Mr. James Melton, Assistant Superintendent, and members of the Title I staff. Mr. Alexander is chairman.

(2) We feel that Local Educational Agencies have received an intense degree of service from the State agency. Multiple visits and opportunities for consultation have been provided.

(3) Many problems have arisen in the evaluation procedure. Shortness of the duration of project operation, lack of specific types of information and the general lack of knowing how to proceed have been major factors in attempting to establish a valid evaluation. The lack of personnel in many school districts has been a contributing factor. Those districts with knowledgeable personnel have helped greatly in the total endeavor.

Legislation may not be the solution to some of these problems. It is a matter of improved leadership and understanding at the local district level.

5. IMPLEMENTATION OF SECTION 205

(a) One of the most common problems encountered was the failure of the LEA to identify specific needs and to focus the activity or activities in a specific way. Considerable revision of projects was necessary from the point of educational quality as well as the mechanics of operation. Parts of projects such as requests for band uniforms were not approved. Projects were generally approved with some deletion or revision.

(b) The basic misconception of some Local Educational Agencies was the lack of understanding that Title I funds could not be administered as general aid to education. The fact that the funds are directed towards serving a specific segment of the school population has been difficult for the leadership in some instances to understand and implement.

6. COORDINATION OF TITLE I AND COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

(a) There were 147 school districts of the existing 200 that had Title I projects in operation where there was an approved Community Action Program. This represented 185 projects of the total approved in the State.

(b) The total amount of Title I money approved for the 147 school districts where there was a Community Action Program was $24,363,719.

(c) Mr. Malcom McCulloch, Liason Officer for O.E.O., a staff member of the Department of Education, devotes his efforts to the coordination and cooperation of Community Action Agencies with Title I projects.

(d, e and f) Early in the program's development, Community Action Agencies were very limited. The lack of local leadership in many instances hindered the program's development. The establishment of leadership in the State Educational Agency to coordinate and develop these programs with ESEA and other federal programs has paid great dividends. Through working with area groups, much has been accomplished in organizing and developing Community Action Programs. There is much evidence of interrelationships of the two programs at the local level, particularly, in the area of pre-school services.

7. INTERRELATIONSHIP OF TITLE I WITH OTHER TITLES OF ESEA

(a) Title II is staffed with the coordinator and the necessary secretarial help to accomplish the allocation of funds. Library and reading consultants in the Division of Instructional Services process booklists and AV materials submitted as a part of Title II projects. An effort is made to coordinate the expansion of library materials with those requested under Title I projects. With the provision of the possibility of personnel under Title I and the ear-marking of library material funds under Title II, great progress has been made in school library services.

(b and c) Title III and IV projects generally are being implemented through clusters of Local Educational Agencies forming a cooperative endeavor. Title I projects are having some effect as these school systems work together.

(d) Personnel has been added in instruction and thus expanded the availability of consultative services available to districts in their Title I project development and implementation.

8. COOPERATIVE PROJECTS BETWEEN DISTRICTS

(a) Only 9 local educational agencies have cooperated in sharing projects. All of these were developed as summer programs. These districts report the projects were very successful as a cooperative venture.

(b) One of the chief factors hindering cooperative project development is that of distance. Most of our local educational agencies can develop effective programs that are self-contained within the district. Summer school programs offer the best opportunity for cooperative efforts.

9. NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PARTICIPATION

(a and b) Each Title I project application included a statement and/or exhibits of correspondence describing how efforts had been made to work with local non-public school officials. Some projects were not approved until such evidence had been presented by public school authorities. In most instances, the cooperation of public school and non-public school officials has been excellent. The heads of various religious denominations and orders have been most cooperative in working with public school officials and the record indicates an amazing amount of non-public school participation in Title I projects.

(c) One of the chief problems hindering more intensive participation of non-public school pupils is the matter of scheduling. Distance from the non-public school to the public school and vice versa also present problems. The most fruitful endeavor has been the development of summer programs. These programs provide an opportunity for all students to participate regardless of where they may attend school during the regular school term.

(d) Services or Activities in which children attending schools participated:	No. of Projects	Number of non-public school children participating:
(1) On public school grounds only:		
During the regular school day	20	2,525
Before School	1	2
After School	6	85
Weekends	2	22
Summer	51	4,867
(2) On non-public school grounds only		
During the regular school day	10	3,327
Before School	0	0
After School	0	0
Weekends	1	30
Summer	3	340
(3) On both public and non-public school grounds		
During the regular school day	9	3,017
Before School	0	0
After School	1	4
Weekends	0	0
Summer	3	258
(4) On other than public or non-public school grounds		
During the regular school day	1	1,793
Before School	0	0
After School	1	1
Weekends	1	7
Summer	3	216
TOTAL	113	16,494

PART II - COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS

1. STATISTICAL INFORMATION

Classification	No. of LEA	Funds Actually Committed	Unduplicated Count of Children				Average cost per pupil Col. 3 by Col. 4
			Total Col. 5 6 and 7	Public	Non-Public	Not Enrolled	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
A	4	2,218,960	23,805	21,072	2,620	113	93.21
B	1	173,317	1,495	720	775	0	115.93
C	15	609,319	5,847	4,337	1,510	0	104.21
D	168	24,057,888	168,213	152,994	11,512	3,707	143.02
E	8	129,785	897	787	77	33	144.73
TOTAL	196	$27,189,269	200,257	179,910	16,494	3,853	135.77

2. ESTABLISHING PROJECT AREAS

(a) Census Information
(b) School Surveys
(c) Health Records
(d) Educational Achievement Records
(e) Free Lunch Records
(f) Food Stamp and other Assistance Programs

3. NEEDS

(a) Poor language facility, especially in the area of reading ability
(b) Social deprivation as compared to middle class standards
(c) Health and nutritional needs
(d) Cultural - such as, music, art, library, etc.
(e) Involvement of parents of culturally deprived students

4. LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY PROBLEMS

(a) Lack of personnel in the areas of Reading, Libraries, Guidance, Special Education, Social Workers as well as Administrative Personnel presented many problems to local educational agencies. In many instances, personnel was pulled out of regular programs in operation in order to staff Title I projects and the resulting vacancies had to be filled with less desirable personnel. In many instances, projects could only be partially implemented because of personnel shortages. Much emphasis has been placed on in-service activities. This is reported elsewhere in this report.

(b) Many school districts have had problems of space in which to conduct programs. Renting, mobile units and more intensive utilization of existing space has helped solve these problems.

(c) With problems in staffing being what they were, instructional materials, library materials, etc., have received emphasis in 1966 projects. 1967 projects are emphasizing increased services to students that revolve around staff services.

5. ACTIVITIES FUNDED

By title, projects having to do with the reading process accounted for 70% of the projects funded. Library projects were extensively funded. Since many projects, regardless of title, contained multiple services, the major areas of activities reflected in all projects are as follows in rank order: Reading and Language Arts, Physical Education and Health, Mathematics, Library Services, Guidance Services, Science, Social Studies, and In-Service Programs.

6. INNOVATIVE PROJECTS

Innovative practices have generally been unique to the school system developing same. For example, one rural system initiated consultative service by employing specialists in English and Mathematics to help teachers work more effectively with culturally deprived secondary students. Several other school districts in the State have been doing this for several years.

In addition to the employment of reading teachers, twenty one (21) districts, all in the D - SMSA category, have employed what they term "Reading Specialists". Innovative practices are much more evident in 1967 projects.

The following Human Interest Stories are submitted as a few of the many that were sent in as a part of the evaluations done by LEA.

> "Children from our school passed through the better residential area of town on a field trip. As they went by some of the most imposing homes they saw an old car parked in a driveway. Several boys shouted in amazement, and one said, "Look at that old '58. That thing is lots older than my brother's. I bet Joe could leave that heap eating his dust."'

"A 12-year old, culturally deprived boy showed his regular teacher an unusual growth on his spine. The teacher immediately referred the boy to the Visiting Teacher. The boy was seen by a hospital physician who referred him to the University Medical Center. The Visiting Teacher took the boy and his mother to the Cetner. It was found that the growth was causing the boy to become more disabled in walking, and that without surgery he would become paralized. He was scheduled for surgery for removal of the growth from his spine. Since this family receives A.F.D.C., their medical program provided for the medical costs, and the case is being serviced by their service worker. The teacher and the parent felt that the services provided through the Title I program saved the child from possible paralysis."

"One of the objectives of the Title I program was to increase school attendance of the participants. One seventh grade student missed a total of 42 days during the 1965-66 school year. After participating in the reading program, she missed only 7½ days as compared to 35½ days before the reading program began. The 7½ days missed were days she was not scheduled for reading classes."

"A little white boy from a rather prominent family in town went home after several days in the Remedial Reading class, and said to his mother, "Mother, my teacher is a Negro, but I think she is the best teacher out there.'"

"A brother and sister had to stay at home on alternate days to take care of younger brothers and sisters because the mother had to go out to work. The little boy came to his teacher and said, "Teacher I like to go to school now. May I bring my little brother and sister to school with me so that I can come to school all the time?'"

"Joe really never got to do anything. He is one of nine children and accepts defeat easily. We had been playing softball for two weeks in physical education class and Joe had never gotten to pitch for his team. He looked up at me with a pleading look and asked, "Can I pitch today, teacher?" I knew he couldn't pitch well as his coordination was poor for his age, but he deserved his chance to try. I felt it wouldn't be much of a game this day but I replied, "Yes." Immediately, I had to silence the jeers and complaints of his classmates at my decision. I don't know how he did it, but Joe struck out the first batter and soon with luck and help from his teammates retired the team at bat. He had in that short inning gained status in the eyes of his classmates. He knew this and he walked straighter and spoke more knowingly from that day forth. It did something for him. He had discovered he was not a complete failure and this gave him the confidence he needed badly and a brighter look on life as a whole."

"At one of our schools in which the ESEA Summer Program was in existence, there was a boy eleven years of age who was a very slow reader. A tape recorder had been purchased under the Title I project which enabled the children to hear their voices. In this boy's case, he heard his voice for the first time. As the summer progressed so did this boy in his ability to read. In fact, one morning when the county superintendent came by, the boy was so overjoyed and elated over his progress in reading, all he wanted to do was read, record, and have the superintendent listen to hear how much he had improved."

"A small boy in a culturally deprived school was so impressed by a new Title I record player that he volunteered to care for it. Each day he made sure that the lid was closed before going home. One objective of this program is for the children to learn to be responsible and care for property."

7. METHODS OF INCREASING STAFF FOR TITLE I PROJECTS

Staffing of 1966 LEA projects was a major problem for local administrators and in many instances was impossible. The task, to the extent that it was accomplished, was done in the following ways:

(a) Teachers already employed with the competencies needed for a special task were reassigned from the regular program and the vacancies thus created were filled with beginning teachers finishing at mid-year or other personnel that became available in the community.

(b) Recruitment of specialists from the teacher ranks where individuals had minimum qualifications in such areas as library, guidance, etc., and persuading these people to enroll in school for additional training.

(c) Starting a program with less than the desired number of personnel necessary to adequately accomplish the program, with a commitment for expansion of personnel employed in 1967. Generally, these commitments have been met.

(d) The extent of staff accomplishment is summarized on page 14.

8. MEASURING INSTRUMENTS

In rank order, the following achievement tests were used to determine the level of accomplishment:

(a) Kindergarten - not reported
(b) Grades 1-3 - California, Stanford, Metropolitan - multiple forms
(c) Grades 4-6 - California, Stanford, Metropolitan - multiple forms
(d) Grades 7-9 - California, Stanford, Metropolitan - multiple forms
(e) Grades 10-12 - California, Stanford, Metropolitan - multiple forms

The following table indicates the percentage of utilization of each test in each category.

Name of Test	Percent by Grades			
	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12
California	40	41	41	56
Stanford	34	30	36	28
Metropolitan	26	29	23	16

The Gates Reading Survey, the Iowa Silent and the S.R.A. Battery were widely used as reading measurements.

9. ANALYSIS OF EFFECTIVE ACTIVITIES AND METHODS:

(a) Project Activities (Promise of Greatest Effectiveness)

(1) Early years - Kindergarten, Reading and Language Arts, Physical Education and Health, Social Services, and School Lunch Programs.

(2) Middle years - Reading and Language Arts, Art and Music, Physical Education and Health, Library Services, and School Lunch Programs.

(3) Teen years - Guidance Services, Library Services, Reading Improvement, Physical Education and Health, and Music and Art.

(b) Language Arts and improving the reading competencies of students, especially in the middle and teen years were largely centered around remediation in projects conducted during the last six to eight weeks of the regular 1966 school term. During the summer programs, there is much evidence that concern for developmental aspects of the reading program has achieved greater recognition. During the regular term, reading teachers were difficult to find and problems of scheduling with the school term in progress were difficult. Therefore, during the summer sessions there was a greater opportunity to accomplish more definite developmental goals.

Physical Education and Health have been greatly enhanced through Title I projects, especially at the elementary level. Numerous physical education teachers have been added at this level and many schools are installing outside black-top play areas properly marked for various types of games. These are enclosed and are not used for parking areas. Much of this is being accomplished in 1967 but the initial steps were begun in the 1966 projects.

Art and Music are on the increase as an integral part of the experiences of the culturally deprived child. The elementary students are profiting greatly from Title I projects, especially in the area of art. These are experiences that these children have never had and they are responding very well.

Library services are having great impact upon the culturally deprived students. Again, the greatest impact has been at the elementary level. About one hundred and fifty (150) part or full time librarians have been added and most of these have been assigned to the elementary level. Kentucky has had a central elementary library program for many years but many schools where cultural deprivation was high, did not have the funds to employ librarians. Title I has indeed had a dramatic impact in this area.

The Guidance program has been greatly expanded particularly at the elementary level. This has been accomplished through a commitment program whereby personnel with minimum qualifications staff the programs and commit themselves to additional training.

School Lunch programs are rendering fine service meeting the lunch needs of deprived students. Breakfast programs in Kentucky are not as well developed as they should be. Improvement in this is indicated for 1967.

10. GENERAL ANALYSIS OF TITLE I

There is no doubt that Title I projects are having great impact on educational opportunities, experiences and general attitudes towards education as they relate to culturally deprived students. The valid documentation of achievement is impossible at this time but there is every evidence that progress is being made in achievement as shown later in this report.

Tabular data shown on pages 10-15 reflect the following:

1. Services and procedures reflected in Title I projects (pages 10, 11, 12, and 13).
2. Staffing for accomplishment of services reflected in Title I projects. This includes both professional and non-professional and reflects the incidence of qualified personnel assigned to professional positions (page 14).
3. Nature of In-Service Programs designed to aid in staff development (page 15).

SERVICES OF TITLE I PROJECTS	REPORT OF PROCEDURES USED TO ACCOMPLISH SERVICES IN TITLE I PROJECTS, 1965-66 — KENTUCKY																								
Reading	31	63	80	35	63	30	44	51	61	20	66	13	44	38	20	48	19	79	142	125	108	94	113	143	139
Language Arts	13	22	26	7	15	7	14	15	19	3	21	6	12	12	10	25	7	24	40	39	36	34	36	49	48
Phys. Ed. & Health	15	31	30	80	45	36	43	41	47	5	30	5	24	25	18	26	3	43	27	45	32	37	23	51	74
Music	16	12	13	4	9	5	11	12	15	4	17	2	8	10	21	16	7	27	19	34	27	29	21	38	40
Art	12	11	16	2	8	6	11	11	14	4	17	4	7	11	11	20	5	30	18	34	26	28	21	41	43
Science	6	10	11	5	11	8	12	11	13	3	12	1	3	3	4	19	2	13	18	19	15	24	18	24	24
Social Studies	7	11	11	6	10	5	11	9	10	2	12	1	2	4	4	15	3	9	18	18	14	21	17	24	24
Mathematics	6	21	25	6	18	9	16	15	21	4	20	5	11	9	5	19	4	20	47	44	35	40	24	44	44
Business Education	-	1	1	-	1	-	1	1	-	6	7	-	-	-	1	-	-	5	3	5	2	7	4	8	6
Foreign Languages	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	2
Industrial Arts	1	1	4	-	2	1	3	3	3	7	6	-	-	1	1	5	1	7	4	8	7	10	3	13	15
T. & I. Education	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
Vocational Agri.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
Home Economics	2	4	1	2	2	2	3	3	4	4	3	-	-	1	-	3	-	2	3	4	5	3	5	6	7
Kindergarten	5	6	8	3	4	4	5	5	7	-	1	2	2	5	3	8	2	3	2	6	4	5	4	6	5

Page 10
PROCEDURES USED IN TITLE I PROJECTS

Parent-Teacher Programs
Home Visits
Parent Conferences
Physical Educ. Program
Eye Care
Dental Care
Medical Care
Provision for Clothing
Provision for Food
Vocational Counseling
Educational Counseling
Special Services Team
Planned Diagnosis
School Visits
Assembly Programs
Field Trips
Tutoring Services
Developmental Instruction
Remedial Instruction
Small Group Instruction
Individualized Instruction
Smaller Class Size
Extended Library Services
Books and Supplies
Additional Inst. Equipment

PROCEDURES USED IN TITLE I PROJECTS

	Social Services	Material Centers	A/V or T. V.	Educational Media Center	School Libraries	Homebound Services	Special Education	Guidance Services	Pupil Personnel	Visiting Teacher	In-Service Programs	School Lunch	Pupil-Teacher Ratio	Transportation	Statistical Services	School Construction	Summer School	Teacher Aides
Parent-Teacher Programs	8	3	3	2	7	2	5	13	-4	-2	5	2	4	-	1	-	4	-
Home Visits	22	-	-	1	4	4	11	29	10	8	1	3	1	3	2	-	2	-
Parent Conferences	16	1	1	1	3	3	11	41	9	8	1	2	3	1	1	-	1	-
Physical Educ. Program	6	2	4	3	7	-	7	11	3	1	7	8	1	5	1	2	2	-
Eye Care	17	1	3	-	3	2	6	7	2	1	3	-	-	7	1	1	1	-
Dental Care	15	1	1	-	2	1	3	4	1	1	3	-	-	7	1	1	1	-
Medical Care	17	1	2	-	3	2	6	4	2	2	3	-	-	8	1	1	-	1
Provision for Clothing	21	-	-	1	1	3	5	13	3	2	3	1	2	-	-	-	2	-
Provision for Food	12	1	-	-	2	1	6	7	1	2	3	39	1	-	-	1	3	-
Vocational Counseling	2	3	2	1	6	-	-	36	-	-	4	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Educational Counseling	6	2	2	2	11	2	7	49	1	2	5	-	1	-	-	1	2	-
Special Services Team	2	1	1	1	2	-	1	7	-	1	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Planned Diagnosis	3	1	-	2	3	-	5	19	1	-	9	2	2	-	-	-	1	-
School Visits	8	2	1	1	5	2	6	13	4	3	4	2	1	2	1	-	1	-
Assembly Programs	2	4	5	1	4	-	3	8	1	-	4	1	2	-	1	-	1	-
Field Trips	4	-	1	1	6	-	8	7	1	1	5	2	1	15	-	-	3	-
Tutoring Services	-	1	4	1	4	-	3	2	-	-	1	-	3	-	-	-	-	1
Developmental Instruction	-	2	3	4	20	3	5	7	2	-	19	1	1	2	2	3	3	-
Remedial Instruction	5	7	12	5	32	5	13	12	3	2	54	13	16	22	2	15	5	10
Small Group Instruction	1	3	8	1	32	1	18	8	1	-	16	1	14	5	-	4	4	-
Individualized Instruction	1	2	7	2	21	3	20	7	1	-	12	-	11	4	-	5	2	1
Smaller Class Size	-	1	2	1	14	1	13	2	-	-	8	2	18	4	2	9	3	1
Extended Library Services	1	15	5	5	62	1	11	5	-	-	10	-	3	2	-	17	3	-
Books and Supplies	2	23	12	5	62	4	15	13	1	2	18	-	4	1	-	4	2	-
Additional Inst. Equipment	-	22	26	6	51	3	12	15	1	2	19	2	5	-	1	8	3	-

SUMMARY OF INCIDENCE OF TOTAL PROCEDURES
OR ACTIVITIES CATEGORIZED BY SUBJECT OR SERVICES

Services	No. Times Appearing in all Services	Percent Total	Services	No. Times Appearing in all Services	Percent Total
Reading	1669	.224	A/V or T.V.	143	.019
Language Arts	540	.072	School Libraries	367	.049
Phys. Ed. & Health	836	.112	Ed. Media Center	49	.006
Music	417	.056	Guidance Services	339	.045
Art	411	.055	Special Education	200	.028
Science	289	.037	Homebound Services	46	.006
Social Studies	268	.036	Pupil Personnel	47	.006
Mathematics	512	.068	Visiting Teacher	45	.006
Business Education	59	.010	In-Service Programs	222	.030
Foreign Languages	7	.001	School Lunch	81	.011
Industrial Arts	106	.014	Pupil-Teacher Ratio	102	.013
T. & I. Education	4	.001	Transportation	88	.012
Vocational Agri.	6	.001	Statistical Services	20	.003
Home Economics	69	.009	School Construction	77	.010
Kindergarten	105	.014	Summer School	52	.006
Social Services	171	.023	Teacher Aides	14	.002
Material Centers	109	.015			
			TOTAL	7470	100%

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES AND PROCEDURES UTILIZED
TO ACCOMPLISH TITLE I PROJECTS CATEGORIZED BY PROCEDURE USED

Procedure	No. Times Appearing	Percent of Total
Parent-Teacher Programs	179	.024
Home Visits	294	.039
Parent Conferences	330	.044
Physical Education Program	220	.030
Eye Care	243	.033
Dental Care	155	.021
Medical Care	228	.030
Provision for Clothing	236	.032
Provision for Food	296	.040
Vocational Counseling	119	.016
Educational Counseling	308	.041
Special Services Team	61	.010
Planned Diagnosis	163	.022
School Visits	175	.023
Assembly Programs	136	.019
Field Trips	262	.035
Tutoring Services	73	.010
Developmental Instruction	355	.048
Remedial Instruction	588	.077
Small Group Instruction	511	.068
Individualized Instruction	418	.056
Smaller Class Size	414	.055
Extended Library Services	436	.058
Books and Supplies	622	.083
Additional Inst. Equipment	648	.086
TOTALS	7470	100%

NEW OR EXTENDED POSITIONS UNDER TITLE I, 1965-66

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATIONAL ASSIGNMENT	ELEMENTARY ASSIGNMENT					SECONDARY ASSIGNMENT				
	Fully Cert.	Emer. Cert.	More Than Half-Time	Half-Time or Less	Total Persons Employed	Fully Cert.	Emer. Cert.	More Than Half-Time	Half-Time or Less	Total Persons Employed
Pre-School	40	11	51		51					
Regular Classroom Teachers	684	16	594	106	700	156		137	19	156
Reading - Language Arts	536	8	536	8	544	101		97	4	101
Mentally Retarded	13	1	14		14	1		1		1
Speech Correctionist	7		6	1	7					
Physically Handi. Include Home Inst.	6	1	7		7					
Supervision	60		37	23	60	16		10	6	16
Administration (Coordinator)	121	2	83	40	123	53	1	28	26	54
Librarian	138	4	132	10	142	21		18	3	21
Guidance	50	1	42	9	51	33	2	26	9	35
Pupil Personnel	9		7	2	9	6		4	2	6
Visiting Teacher	24		24		24	3		1	2	3
TOTAL	1688	44	1533	199	1732	390	3	322	71	393

NON-PROF. EDUCATIONAL ASSIGNMENT	More Than Half-Time	Half-Time or Less	Total Persons Employed	More Than Half-Time	Half-Time or Less	Total Persons Employed
Nurse	25	3	28	3	6	9
Teacher Aides	1750	91	1841	318	21	339
Custodial	119	46	165	24	13	37
School Lunch	195	70	265	36	2	38
Bus Drivers	249	33	282	6	1	7
Social Worker	6		6			
Directors of Recreation		9	9			
TOTAL	2344	252	2596	387	43	430

The above summary of personnel represents the reporting of 90% of LEA projects. The large number of fully qualified professional people employed is a great tribute to the leadership of school administrators at the local district level. Considering the time of implementation of LEA projects, the few emergency people employed is indeed amazing. The employment of teacher aides as indicated in the non-professional category is one of the outstanding contributions of Title I projects to an improved educational endeavor.

IN-SERVICE ACTIVITIES

NATURE OF IN-SERVICE		
Use of Equipment or Materials		164
Improvement - Teaching Techniques or Method		166
Child Study Programs		59
Methods of Evaluation		99
	TOTAL	488
PARTICIPATION		
Number of Teachers		8,904
Number of Other Staff		1,315
	TOTAL	10,219
Number of Hours Spent by all Participants		6,175
CONDUCTION		
By Local Staff		91
State Department Personnel		33
Local Area Personnel		49
University or College Personnel		105
On College Campus		53
Commercial Consultant		55
	TOTAL	386
COST		
Consultants		$65,643
Travel, tuition, teacher salaries, food, lodging, etc.		$453,878
	TOTAL	$519.521
EVALUATION OF BENEFIT OF ACTIVITIES		
Substantial		132
Some		28
Little or None		10

PART III TABULAR DATA

Measures	Projects in: Skill Development Subjects Grades 1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12
1. Standardized Tests and Inventories				
a. Achievement	175	200	203	98
b. Intelligence	105	106	107	48
c. Aptitude	8	7	18	18
d. Interest	8	7	14	8
e. Attitude	6	6	6	7
2. Other Tests				
a. Teacher Made Tests	196	209	217	212
3. Other Measures				
a. Teacher Ratings	129	239	246	240
b. Anecdotal Records	154	154	154	154
c. Observer Reports	119	158	111	106

The most widely used achievement tests were the California, Stanford and Metropolitan in this order. Since a major number of Title I projects focused on Reading or Language Arts, reading tests were used in addition to the achievement test batteries. The most widely used of these reading tests were the Gates Reading Survey, S.R.A., and Iowa Silent.

Teacher made tests and rating scales have been widely used in studying pupil progress in Title I projects. Cumulative records, including anecdotal records, have been extensively initiated or expanded especially in these LEA's where such records had received a minimum of attention in the past. Title I projects have thus had great impact on the program of child study in many school districts. This is indeed a dramatic contribution.

EVALUATION OF DEGREE OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED
TITLE I PROJECT, 1965-66

School Level	PRIMARY OBJECTIVE			OBJECTIVE 2		
	Substantial Progress Achieved	Some Progress Achieved	Little or No Progress Achieved	Substantial Progress Achieved	Some Progress Achieved	Little or No Progress Achieved
Pre-School	22	15	2	22	8	2
Grades 1-3	170	129	18	138	110	8
Grades 4-6	199	127	19	163	111	8
Grades 7-9	191	132	24	167	102	12
Grades 10-12	110	83	25	100	74	8
TOTAL	692	486	88	590	405	38

1. Primary Objective

The primary objective of the projects listed above was that of improvement of language competency. The primary focus of the projects was on the improvement of reading competence. The services utilized to accomplish this objective centered around remedial instruction, small group activities, individualized instruction, smaller class size, and extended library services. In many instances, it was evident that the developmental program received considerable emphasis.

2. SECONDARY OBJECTIVE

The secondary objectives that were concomitant with the primary objectives of reading were improved competence in music, art, mathematics, science, and health and physical education. The accomplishment of these secondary objectives in addition to small group procedures and similar activities were characterized by field trips, school visits and assembly programs. The accomplishment of both the primary and secondary objectives were greatly enhanced by extensive purchase of books, instructional supplies and instructional equipment.

COMPARISON OF WITHDRAWALS, ADM AND ADA, GRADES 7-12 OF SELECTED LEA's WITH STATE TOTALS OF ALL LEA's

KENTUCKY

W6 -- A pupil who became 16 and dropped out.
W7 -- A pupil excused from school because of mental or physical disability.
W8 -- A pupil withdrawn because of death.
W9 -- A pupil graduated from high school.
W10 - A pupil discharged.
W11 - A pupil excused from school because of marriage.

(Selected Rural LEA Districts with High Percentage of Economic Deprivation)

	W6			W7			W8			W9			W10			W11			ADM			ADA		
	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66
TOTALS	1,576	1,653	1,661	153	169	171	18	14	20	53	114	87	66	47	50	282	302	296	82,225	80,273	78,483	76,389	74,970	73,548

(Selected LEA Districts with High Density of Urban Population)

	W6			W7			W8			W9			W10			W11			ADM			ADA		
	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66
TOTALS	2,200	2,432	2,347	239	293	345	19	9	13	9	15	31	150	148	118	242	239	187	140,467	145,327	149,427	131,923	136,809	140,664

(Total of all Districts from the State)

	W6			W7			W8			W9			W10			W11			ADM			ADA		
	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66
TOTALS	10,121	10,723	10,321	1,306	1,294	1,382	115	72	115	242	465	443	649	684	615	1,860	1,808	1,604	649,605	654,315	656,640	609,332	616,860	618,622

Of the causes of withdrawals listed above, W6, W10, and W11 constitute real categories of school dropouts. The following table indicates the loss of students, grades 7-12, per 10,000 students enrolled. It should be noted that those schools representing economically deprived areas have much greater incidence of dropout than the urban schools, as well as a greater dropout than the state average.

(Dropout Loss Per 10,000 ADM Other Than Disability and Death)

	1964	1965	1966
Rural LEA's, high economic deprivation	240	250	257
Urban LEA's, high density population	185	194	177
State Average	194	203	190

SUMMARY, WITHDRAWALS, ADM, ADA - Grades 7-12

KENTUCKY

District	Age :6 W6			Disability W7			Death W8			Completed H.S. W9			Discharged W10			Marriage W11			ADM			ADA		
	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66
Adair Co.	51	52	48	7	8	5	1	1	2	1	4	6	-	-	-	14	13	11	3163	3075	2981	2911	2855	2770
Allen Co.	32	19	26	1	4	4	-	-	1	1	7	2	1	2	2	10	9	11	2070	2053	2044	1929	1938	1943
Anderson Co.	14	15	13	12	6	3	1	-	1	-	-	2	-	3	-	12	15	3	1948	1997	1986	1840	1873	1877
Ashland Ind.	126	107	114	17	16	10	1	-	-	1	3	-	4	4	-	7	11	7	6459	6771	6438	6082	6087	6015
Augusta Ind.	7	1	4	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	306	308	319	290	296	302
Ballard Co.	28	24	12	17	2	7	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	3	2	9	1671	1673	1621	1587	1600	1543
Barbourville Ind.	13	14	9	-	2	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	1	572	503	515	537	477	484
Bardstown Ind.	15	5	11	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	2	1	925	1036	1126	899	1003	1088
Barren Co.	53	70	37	5	2	6	1	-	1	2	3	1	-	2	-	24	13	16	3622	3659	3592	3403	3469	3407
Bath Co.	34	33	28	6	2	5	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	5	8	7	2069	2015	2025	1878	1853	1869
Beechwood Ind.	2	3	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	399	391	400	384	377	383
Bell Co.	104	119	125	35	48	26	3	1	1	9	14	6	-	-	-	20	22	28	5867	5608	5550	5378	5230	5211
Bellevue Ind.	14	16	11	-	6	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	1	1	1	-	957	955	1005	907	912	944
Benton Ind.	4	4	7	2	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	-	-	4	2	2	830	838	854	801	808	819
Berea Ind.	13	7	13	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	4	2	-	548	614	623	521	583	594
Boone Co.	70	92	92	8	7	13	2	1	2	-	-	-	5	9	4	8	5	11	5216	5458	5665	4903	5148	5348
Bourbon Co.	38	23	30	3	2	5	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	3	5	15	9	12	2478	2525	2522	2313	2380	2373
Bowling Green	59	88	82	3	9	9	-	1	1	-	2	1	6	8	3	5	12	14	5138	5346	5362	4826	5057	5091
Boyd Co.	45	54	46	9	3	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	8	10	9	3497	3661	3658	3313	3471	3480
Boyle Co.	51	44	36	4	2	3	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	4	1	2	5	11	2094	2166	2167	1973	2071	2058
Bracken Co.	9	11	12	5	3	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	1	5	3	-	1198	1176	1124	1140	1132	1072

SUMMARY, WITHDRAWALS, ADM, ADA - Grades 7-12
KENTUCKY

District	W6			W7			W8			W9			W10			W11			ADM			ADA		
	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66
Breathitt Co.	95	76	60	3	5	2	-	-	1	1	-	5	-	2	1	14	9	5	4027	4061	4086	3869	3935	3966
Breckinridge Co.	35	24	29	4	5	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	9	10	5	2801	2835	2834	2650	2701	2679
Bullitt Co.	75	79	105	20	19	16	-	-	-	-	-	2	3	3	4	9	25	16	4461	4716	5094	4189	4446	4792
Burgin Ind.	7	9	6	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	375	382	376	357	362	355
Butler Co.	35	40	38	3	2	8	1	-	-	8	5	5	-	2	2	11	9	13	2326	2239	2242	2181	2128	2122
Caldwell Co.	38	46	46	5	5	7	1	-	3	-	-	1	3	5	2	2	3	2	2940	2935	2910	2770	2785	2762
Calloway Co.	29	20	28	5	7	6	-	-	-	5	1	1	2	-	-	8	7	12	2063	2055	2114	1950	1964	1995
Campbell Co.	63	66	62	3	6	6	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	1	1	2	6	5	3790	3870	3976	3554	3641	3745
Campbellsville	10	21	6	2	2	3	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	1	1	3	3	8	1574	1577	1534	1502	1497	1478
Carlisle	14	4	11	-	3	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	3	2	984	987	949	933	941	906
Carroll Co.	5	5	33	2	-	10	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	5	-	1	7	822	857	1720	772	818	1640
Carrollton Ind.	31	23	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	6	6	-	904	890	--	856	858	--
Carter Co.	60	95	76	9	10	3	4	1	-	1	1	1	-	1	6	17	11	16	5162	5251	5051	4764	4885	4701
Casey Co.	71	54	63	10	8	6	-	1	1	2	2	5	5	1	-	8	18	17	3001	2895	2721	2761	2667	2530
Catlettsburg Ind.	18	26	20	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	3	5	1	1	4	914	879	854	860	834	797
Caverna Ind.	15	14	4	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	4	5	2	891	932	970	842	879	913
Central City Ind.	8	2	10	-	-	1	3	-	1	1	1	-	1	5	-	7	8	-	1051	1013	1001	1005	974	958
Christian Co.	73	65	66	11	11	18	-	-	-	7	10	7	4	4	3	19	14	19	5650	5870	6090	5334	5575	5758
Clark Co.	85	65	99	7	8	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	13	19	10	11	13	9	4895	4970	5036	4639	4727	4768
Clay Co.	132	141	110	10	10	9	-	-	-	5	12	3	8	3	5	31	25	11	5620	5530	5478	5010	4960	5059
Clinton Co.	25	29	26	8	3	1	-	-	1	3	4	3	1	-	-	9	10	8	2117	2011	1959	1976	1912	1841

SUMMARY, WITHDRAWALS, ADM, ADA - Grades 7-12
KENTUCKY

District	W6			W7			W8			W9			W10			W11			ADM			ADA		
	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66
Cloverport Ind.	13	19	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	397	360	350	379	343	335
Corbin Ind.	19	35	14	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	4	7	1438	1534	1536	1357	1441	1458
Covington Ind.	168	218	199	15	21	20	1	1	4	-	1	-	22	30	25	12	11	8	7914	8018	7915	7341	7523	7388
Crittenden Co.	26	17	23	2	-	3	1	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	8	8	4	1843	1830	1805	1727	1733	1700
Cumberland Co.	25	32	30	3	3	4	-	1	-	-	2	-	2	2	2	8	5	15	1699	1690	1639	1564	1571	1527
Danville Ind.	25	30	17	4	5	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	2	4	4	6	2435	2402	2414	2325	2318	2320
Daviess Co.	77	76	99	5	14	5	-	-	-	1	2	4	2	2	4	16	9	7	5940	6129	6238	5663	5879	5965
Dawson Springs	4	7	6	3	-	1	-	-	-	2	1	1	-	-	-	3	1	5	586	579	567	544	548	535
Dayton Ind.	27	33	29	4	7	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	6	6	-	1	8	1462	1484	1517	1349	1392	1410
Earlington Ind.	12	7	5	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	1	2	3	1	693	670	671	665	642	644
East Bernstadt	3	7	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	300	305	313	291	296	302
Edmonson Co.	51	34	39	2	-	2	1	1	-	7	10	13	2	2	1	12	10	4	1861	1881	1904	1713	1762	1756
Elizabethtown Ind.	15	32	32	3	12	5	-	-	-	-	1	3	4	4	6	8	10	3	2258	2351	2359	2179	2272	2270
Elliott Co.	25	12	25	5	4	2	4	1	-	-	4	3	1	9	6	6	3	3	1660	1578	1551	1535	1474	1495
Eminence Ind.	7	8	4	4	-	-	2	-	1	-	2	1	2	2	-	5	2	3	571	559	551	554	547	532
Erlanger Ind.	15	20	26	6	3	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	2	4	1	2	3	1891	1942	2125	1805	1856	2020
Estill Co.	34	57	54	6	10	4	2	-	-	-	2	4	13	15	12	10	16	9	2028	1976	2195	1883	1841	2061
Fairview Ind.	17	14	18	4	1	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1337	1353	1364	1277	1300	1302
Falmouth Ind.	7	5	9	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	5	-	3	2	-	521	526	507	488	498	475
Fayette Co.	203	223	230	23	18	17	2	2	2	4	13	18	19	27	23	22	16	12	17,996	19,534	21,202	16,966	18,448	19,937
Ferguson Ind.	13	24	13	2	1	4	-	-	-	1	3	-	-	1	1	1	3	4	516	505	478	489	470	457

SUMMARY, WITHDRAWALS, ADM, ADA - Grades 7-12

KENTUCKY

District	W6			W7			W8			W9			W10			W11			ADM			ADA		
	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66
Fleming Co.	22	33	32	1	2	1	-	-	-	1	-	7	1	1	2	9	-	4	2480	2467	2406	2343	2333	2278
Floyd Co.	174	229	256	9	25	15	3	1	3	9	14	18	19	12	5	37	38	45	11,810	11,566	11,113	11,069	10,882	10,480
Ft. Thomas Ind.	4	8	7	1	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	2	2	1763	1817	1862	1689	1746	1783
Frankfort Ind.	25	17	32	3	2	5	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	3	14	3	3	1	1302	1272	1244	1248	1219	1182
Franklin Co.	65	81	67	27	3	18	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	5	7	12	11	7	4575	4694	4839	4319	4431	4551
Fulton Co.	24	29	30	10	2	7	-	-	-	1	-	3	2	1	1	1	2	6	1752	1645	1633	1639	1544	1525
Fulton City	6	5	2	1	1	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	733	742	726	718	727	710
Gallatin Co.	15	16	17	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	874	903	907	806	843	843
Garrard Co.	29	26	28	6	2	5	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	-	8	7	9	2072	2027	2058	1931	1902	1920
Georgetown Ind.	18	15	20	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	3	4	-	-	-	1	2	1	1082	1095	1048	997	1015	964
Glasgow Ind.	34	28	56	4	14	7	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	20	9	13	2472	2429	2545	2342	2318	2424
Grant Co.	22	30	21	2	5	-	-	-	-	2	4	-	-	5	8	7	5	3	1779	1765	1718	1678	1676	1621
Graves Co.	56	54	44	7	4	2	1	-	-	3	3	-	1	-	1	12	7	15	4166	4172	4088	3970	3969	3913
Grayson Co.	58	69	46	1	2	1	1	-	-	2	1	1	1	2	-	13	13	6	2619	2568	2557	2445	2393	2378
Green Co.	9	7	13	8	4	7	-	-	1	2	3	1	-	-	-	18	15	14	2175	2172	2192	2035	2037	2060
Greenup Co.	65	47	68	22	12	18	-	-	-	-	3	1	4	-	2	5	11	9	4162	4079	4188	3895	3839	3906
Greenup Ind.	3	8	5	1	1	-	1	1	1	2	-	-	1	-	-	5	5	2	531	534	530	500	504	501
Greenville Ind.	7	9	6	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	1051	1020	1008	1003	980	966
Hancock Co.	15	22	18	6	9	6	-	-	-	1	5	1	1	-	-	3	9	6	1158	1198	1204	1105	1151	1157
Hardin Co.	97	111	87	15	10	17	2	1	1	1	-	2	-	4	-	27	11	14	6362	6629	6918	6082	6346	6610
Harlan Co.	231	199	252	3	6	8	2	5	2	7	17	19	1	-	2	22	47	30	10,053	9776	9483	9325	9223	8869

SUMMARY, WITHDRAWALS, ADM, ADA - Grades 7-12

KENTUCKY

District	W6			W7			W8			W9			W10			W11			ADM			ADA		
	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66
Harlan City	33	33	35	9	2	4	-	-	-	1	3	2	5	10	3	6	-	3	1623	1549	1504	1536	1474	1427
Harrison Co.	31	51	28	5	6	6	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	2	1	7	11	3	2944	2961	2946	2808	2816	2804
Harrodsburg Ind.	21	13	12	3	1	1	-	-	-	1	9	-	-	-	1	5	6	11	1351	1357	1385	1283	1291	1296
Hart Co.	56	62	50	11	4	7	2	-	-	-	1	2	4	3	2	13	13	12	2934	2863	2802	2694	2655	2580
Hazard Ind.	42	38	21	2	3	4	1	-	2	2	3	1	4	5	6	1	3	5	2111	2085	2052	2032	2001	1973
Henderson Co.	31	53	70	8	8	4	1	1	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	16	7	-	4077	4256	4464	3868	4039	4220
Henderson City	45	48	37	3	4	4	3	-	-	-	2	4	21	26	39	8	18	4	3213	3173	3090	3029	3000	2907
Henry Co.	37	17	20	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	3	5	2	1854	1818	1797	1741	1728	1693
Hickman Co.	13	21	16	-	9	5	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	5	5	5	1340	1336	1334	1270	1278	1258
Hopkins Co.	120	105	95	23	16	13	-	-	-	-	7	10	6	1	1	42	23	32	7473	7489	7380	7052	7095	6986
Hopkinsville Ind.	56	62	26	7	7	7	-	-	1	-	-	-	6	11	3	25	24	8	4108	4032	3820	3899	3837	3637
Irvine Ind.	11	17	8	2	4	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	3	1	1	2	609	587	592	577	562	564
Jackson County	52	60	48	4	5	15	-	-	2	2	3	6	-	4	4	20	20	23	2713	2634	2636	2402	2341	2380
Jackson City	10	9	11	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	1	437	413	382	411	394	363
Jefferson Co.	508	620	662	106	137	167	7	3	8	2	-	6	59	56	69	116	143	101	63,148	66,294	69,222	59,875	63,146	65,844
Jenkins Ind.	25	23	21	4	7	3	-	-	4	3	1	1	-	2	-	3	5	5	1412	1334	1319	1360	1292	1268
Jessamine Co.	52	56	42	3	6	3	-	1	-	10	13	16	-	-	1	8	10	6	3240	3345	3505	2983	3086	3191
Johnson Co.	42	52	55	10	11	10	-	-	-	2	3	2	3	4	2	16	11	13	3591	3424	3311	3337	3187	3081
Kenton Co.	94	95	111	18	13	16	1	-	-	-	-	-	8	4	3	6	10	8	6914	7137	7433	6525	6789	7056
Knott Co.	89	82	66	10	6	5	2	-	1	-	2	-	9	7	12	10	12	11	4929	4877	4852	4572	4543	4528
Knox Co.	96	107	88	6	5	7	-	-	1	9	21	27	-	-	-	23	22	26	5512	5398	5410	4954	4932	5026

SUMMARY, WITHDRAWALS, ADM, ADA - Grades 7-12

KENTUCKY

District	W6			W7			W8			W9			W10			W11			ADM			ADA		
	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66
LaRue Co.	31	27	17	5	7	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	20	14	6	2405	2450	2466	2283	2346	2360
Laurel Co.	91	94	80	18	17	12	-	1	1	6	20	6	3	3	-	23	28	21	5509	5310	5183	5099	4959	4842
Lawrence Co.	63	54	62	5	8	1	2	1	1	-	-	2	5	4	3	2	9	9	2898	2816	2732	2656	2556	2509
Lee Co.	36	28	39	3	1	6	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	4	7	5	6	3	1971	1950	1894	1803	1825	1769
Leitchfield Ind.	9	9	10	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	1	2	2	-	830	838	850	792	808	816
Leslie Co.	87	108	85	5	4	5	-	-	-	-	4	9	4	-	2	14	20	17	4256	4253	4153	3859	3910	3834
Letcher Co.	145	127	122	9	10	6	-	-	6	1	8	1	5	7	3	22	21	26	6838	6628	6448	6427	6194	6033
Lewis Co.	61	39	50	10	7	2	-	1	2	-	1	-	-	4	3	10	8	8	3308	3263	3122	3035	3027	2899
Lexington Ind.	204	254	206	11	23	15	2	2	1	3	1	6	48	43	19	23	11	8	10,046	10,152	9802	9329	9445	9106
Liberty Ind.	8	11	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	5	-	-	559	555	529	521	519	494
Lincoln Co.	56	72	94	14	7	13	-	4	-	6	11	19	-	2	7	14	6	3	3280	3292	3998	3052	3082	3752
Livingston Co.	13	20	13	7	7	8	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	2	-	8	6	4	1600	1586	1527	1517	1513	1464
Logan Co.	52	51	36	5	10	13	-	-	1	1	2	4	7	7	2	11	4	21	3448	3449	3447	3199	3228	3225
London Ind.	14	15	6	4	2	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	3	6	3	1125	1177	1136	1080	1125	1093
Louisville Ind.	1285	1335	1249	99	115	146	3	2	2	-	1	1	24	22	7	81	69	66	49,277	49,347	49,201	45,753	45,770	45,777
Ludlow Ind.	13	16	14	2	5	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	6	5	7	-	1	-	832	869	863	783	828	814
Lynch Ind.	5	5	5	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	-	1	-	2	856	818	733	825	793	704
Lyon Co.	13	21	16	4	-	1	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	1	5	1	959	924	937	902	883	895
Madison Co.	86	61	73	10	38	28	2	-	5	-	-	1	10	6	10	13	11	8	4373	4444	4459	4009	4140	4150
Magoffin Co.	50	47	58	4	2	2	-	2	-	2	8	4	-	4	1	15	15	9	2966	2896	2914	2753	2662	2711
Marion Co.	56	49	48	10	10	11	-	-	-	-	1	-	3	4	5	6	15	6	3105	3157	3119	2927	2977	2934

SUMMARY, WITHDRAWALS, ADM, ADA - Grades 7-12

KENTUCKY

District	W6			W7			W8			W9			W10			W11			ADM			ADA		
	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66
Marshall Co.	38	24	34	5	11	7	1	2	1	9	7	12	-	-	3	15	14	10	3360	3363	3421	3213	3239	3270
Martin Co.	46	51	61	8	6	3	-	-	1	-	2	1	-	-	4	4	7	13	2863	2872	2957	2653	2660	2772
Mason Co.	42	51	31	1	4	-	-	-	-	2	3	4	1	-	-	7	3	7	2402	2409	2406	2260	2287	2279
Mayfield Ind.	17	25	22	3	2	7	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	5	-	2067	2122	2102	1958	2008	1983
Maysville Ind.	24	14	15	8	2	4	-	-	-	-	2	1	3	1	2	4	2	2	1505	1455	1405	1430	1401	1353
McCracken Co.	34	34	36	4	11	2	1	1	-	-	3	-	2	1	2	14	8	9	5456	5642	5751	5236	5431	5522
McCreary Co.	71	99	81	7	5	2	-	-	-	3	4	5	-	1	3	9	13	12	3644	3592	3513	3426	3376	3306
McLean Co.	34	25	27	1	4	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	5	12	4	2088	2055	2045	1971	1959	1949
Meade Co.	38	28	35	1	8	7	1	1	1	-	1	2	-	-	-	6	9	7	3258	3355	3293	3089	3221	3157
Menifee Co.	19	30	32	3	1	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	19	1	4	7	3	1064	1068	1020	967	961	917
Mercer Co.	20	19	12	5	5	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	10	5	6	1598	1570	1551	1481	1461	1426
Metcalfe Co.	17	19	22	2	5	1	-	-	-	-	1	3	1	-	1	6	1	3	1596	1634	1687	1495	1549	1580
Middlesboro Ind.	55	88	77	8	8	6	-	-	-	1	-	1	21	3	-	12	10	7	2890	2790	2737	2698	2580	2552
Monroe Co.	31	34	16	7	3	4	-	-	1	-	3	3	1	-	-	17	5	16	2781	2750	2759	2607	2604	2613
Montgomery Co.	35	38	55	5	3	8	-	1	-	1	7	7	-	-	-	5	6	4	2225	2403	2410	2052	2230	2226
Monticello Ind.	13	28	21	1	2	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	1	5	3	838	840	824	807	812	792
Morgan Co.	46	38	41	4	3	4	-	-	1	1	3	8	16	-	1	10	13	5	2766	2736	2726	2616	2597	2576
Mt. Sterling Ind.	12	13	13	2	1	-	-	-	-	3	-	2	3	4	-	3	-	-	1263	1136	1153	1210	1085	1100
Muhlenberg Co.	67	46	56	6	2	1	-	1	2	4	2	12	3	-	1	12	21	13	4895	4652	4499	4516	4343	4175
Murray Ind.	15	17	22	4	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	1	1505	1530	1541	1446	1471	1474
Nelson Co.	40	42	37	5	1	6	-	-	1	-	1	-	7	5	8	8	5	4	2573	2594	2588	2454	2472	2455

SUMMARY, WITHDRAWALS, ADM, ADA - Grades 7-12

KENTUCKY

District	W6			W7			W8			W9			W10			W11			ADM			ADA		
	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66
Newport Ind.	121	98	98	12	12	7	1	-	1	-	-	2	9	4	11	3	11	9	4046	4121	4048	3787	3881	3790
Nicholas Ind.	30	19	17	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	5	5	7	1359	1340	1372	1243	1256	1277
Ohio Co.	72	87	71	3	7	13	-	2	-	4	7	6	2	5	-	20	17	16	3955	3946	3964	3654	3715	3714
Oldham Co.	24	27	44	5	8	3	2	-	1	1	1	1	1	4	4	7	6	2	2583	2647	2770	2431	2512	2612
Owen Co.	23	43	31	5	2	2	-	-	1	-	2	-	1	3	-	5	-	4	1747	1741	1650	1619	1659	1562
Owensboro Ind.	102	106	107	17	13	19	2	-	1	2	1	-	7	18	2	33	20	13	7104	7138	7196	6711	6800	6854
Owsley Co.	19	14	15	3	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	4	-	-	4	2	6	1268	1245	1279	1163	1175	1211
Paducah Ind.	81	93	92	12	3	6	1	-	1	-	2	-	15	14	17	12	10	6	6591	6580	6514	6246	6186	6287
Paintsville Ind.	16	19	11	-	1	3	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	2	5	4	4	2	1111	1114	1082	1056	1051	1025
Paris Ind.	20	19	23	7	5	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	1	1	2	5	6	1	1777	1745	1723	1675	1650	1637
Pendleton Co.	23	36	12	4	3	4	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	1	1	1842	1824	1806	1711	1720	1707
Perry Co.	177	193	172	15	18	54	5	3	4	3	12	2	16	8	11	20	13	31	7501	7366	7238	6951	6822	6732
Pike Co.	344	347	348	37	22	33	2	3	1	3	8	4	5	6	14	68	69	58	17,394	17,200	16,848	16,470	16,280	15,955
Pikeville Ind.	16	17	19	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	3	1	1	4	5	4	1492	1503	1423	1421	1443	1366
Pineville Ind.	5	11	12	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	6	2	717	735	670	691	712	654
Powell Co.	31	43	28	1	5	5	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	6	5	6	8	6	1842	1862	1856	1688	1735	1750
Providence Ind.	9	13	13	5	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	6	9	-	929	894	881	877	859	837
Pulaski Co.	80	86	83	11	3	21	-	1	2	3	12	3	13	6	6	19	15	13	5289	5399	5267	4989	5112	4954
Raceland Ind.	12	12	10	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	3	-	3	2	3	917	954	953	870	915	906
Richmond Ind.	27	46	45	4	5	7	1	1	-	2	2	1	-	2	-	7	3	4	1707	1713	1620	1614	1620	1521
Robertson Co.	6	6	5	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	458	463	468	432	442	443

SUMMARY, WITHDRAWALS, ADM, ADA - Grades 7-12

KENTUCKY

District	W6			W7			W8			W9			W10			W11			ADM			ADA		
	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66
Rockcastle Co.	20	29	36	10	7	4	2	-	-	1	1	-	4	2	3	14	12	10	3188	3158	3126	2980	2971	2914
Rowan Co.	42	53	50	6	-	3	-	-	1	1	4	2	-	-	-	6	6	7	2535	2488	2458	2346	2325	2291
Russell Co.	31	31	20	17	5	9	-	-	-	12	15	7	1	1	1	7	3	1	2706	2662	2605	2552	2534	2461
Russell Ind.	32	27	24	7	2	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	7	3	2643	2776	2813	2507	2654	2683
Russellville Ind.	22	10	13	1	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	3	3	1	-	1370	1363	1436	1288	1301	1368
Scott Co.	23	26	39	4	5	3	-	-	-	2	6	5	1	2	2	5	11	5	2236	2245	2396	2041	2059	2200
Scottsville Ind.	8	13	8	-	2	3	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	4	3	7	612	595	608	580	572	578
Shelby Co.	26	33	29	2	1	11	2	-	-	-	-	-	7	4	4	8	10	6	2645	2658	2660	2479	2488	2484
Shelbyville Ind.	5	16	14	3	3	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	3	5	4	4	1558	1584	1613	1493	1516	1532
Silver Grove	9	5	9	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	437	425	427	413	407	407
Simpson Co.	27	31	27	8	4	5	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	8	4	14	2808	2857	2912	2635	2701	2752
Somerset Ind.	19	18	22	4	6	4	-	-	1	-	1	-	7	3	1	3	9	5	2637	2492	2468	2509	2389	2368
So. Portsmouth	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	229	225	--	221	214	--
Spencer Co.	20	24	11	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	7	6	5	1195	1191	1199	1102	1111	1123
Stanford Ind.	5	2	-	3	2	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	3	4	-	813	740	--	778	714	--
Taylor Co.	24	28	17	5	2	6	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	15	5	10	2173	2148	2170	2051	2033	2070
Todd Co.	30	38	46	6	14	13	-	-	2	-	-	1	2	3	2	4	8	5	2579	2564	2555	2405	2418	2404
Trigg Co.	26	28	37	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	3	5	1	6	2006	1944	1947	1911	1869	1862
Trimble Co.	15	19	26	2	2	3	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	8	6	2	1190	1177	1206	1122	1112	1132
Union Co.	56	55	46	3	3	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	1	2	-	9	10	4	2492	2529	2602	2374	2419	2486
Van Lear Ind.	10	10	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	303	295	300	281	267	273

SUMMARY, WITHDRAWALS, ADM, ADA - Grades 7-12

KENTUCKY

District	W6			W7			W8			W9			W10			W11			ADM			ADA		
	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66	64	65	66
Walton-Verona Ind.	5	6	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	655	711	751	623	684	717
Warren Co.	80	89	74	8	9	6	2	-	4	1	4	2	2	-	2	16	22	23	4513	4636	4801	4210	4367	4541
Washington Co.	26	23	18	4	5	5	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	3	9	8	4	1992	1995	1980	1875	1884	1864
Wayne Co.	43	56	45	6	3	1	1	-	-	2	1	-	3	3	5	12	15	11	3024	2950	2913	2836	2792	2752
Webster Co.	21	15	17	3	3	4	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	2	-	4	8	7	2050	2143	2108	1920	2015	1965
West Point Ind.	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	215	204	251	206	195	235
Whitley Co.	133	85	107	22	18	12	2	-	-	19	39	33	10	32	26	15	15	22	4409	4236	4083	3979	3859	3751
Williamsburg Ind.	9	18	10	3	1	1	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	850	840	802	802	795	759
Williamstown Ind.	2	8	4	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	371	359	367	352	345	350
Wolfe Co.	31	37	32	2	8	7	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	2	5	4	3	1658	1637	1638	1530	1492	1508
Woodford Co.	55	65	62	11	19	20	4	-	-	-	2	1	7	1	4	5	5	7	2860	3005	3036	2637	2790	2809
*TOTALS	10,121	10,723	10,321	1306	1294	1382	115	72	115	242	465	443	649	684	615	1860	1808	1604	649,605	654,315	656,640	609,332	616,860	618,622

*ADM and ADA totals include the school districts which did not submit Title I projects

EFFECTIVENESS OF TITLE I PROGRAM AS REFLECTED BY STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS

School Level Involved in Project Activities	Total number of students	Total number of students achieving average increments of attainment level increases due to project activities which are over and above that which would have been expected under normal conditions.					Total number of Title I projects by number of months of project activity which could have resulted in direct instructional benefit to students.				
		0 - .2	.3 - .4	.5 - .7	.8 - 1.0	1. +	2	3	4	5	6
Grades 1-3	18,881	11,192	4,538	2,148	538	465	36	8	14	6	5
Grades 4-6	25,844	12,176	7,076	4,333	1,035	1,224	49	12	21	7	4
Grades 7-9	21,521	9,447	2,847	6,891	399	1,937	50	11	19	11	3
Grades 10-12	8,186	3,747	834	3,018	52	535	25	4	10	6	3
TOTAL	74,432	36,562	15,295	16,390	2,024	4,161	160	35	64	30	15

COMMENTS:

The above totals include the students participating in summer programs. One hundred sixty seven (167) LEA's conducted summer programs of six to eight weeks duration. Students enrolled in the projects getting under way during the closing weeks of the 1966 regular school term, had the opportunity for continued activities during the summer. These summer programs were the direct cause of some progress in achievement. Reports from the projects conducted during the regular term indicated very little progress. This is understandable since regular term projects were in existence for such a short period of time.

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS IN TITLE I PROJECT HIGH SCHOOLS
CONTINUING EDUCATION BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL COMPARED TO STATE NORM

	1963 - 1964		1964 - 1965		1965 - 1966	
	Title I Schools	1/3	Title I Schools	1/3	Title I Schools	1/3
TOTAL NUMBER OF GRADUATES	4,197	9,145	4,857	10,766	4,756	11,556
MEAN SIZE OF GRADUATING CLASS	76.3	155.0	88.3	179.4	86.5	189.4
NUMBER OF SCHOOLS HAVING 0 - 10% CONTINUING GRADS.	0	0	0	0	0	0
11 - 20%	2	1	1	1	0	0
21 - 30%	7	5	8	5	6	4
31 - 40%	10	15	10	12	8	11
41 - 50%	17	14	13	11	15	13
51 - 60%	7	7	10	16	12	17
61 - 99%	12	17	13	15	14	16
NUMBER OF SCHOOLS	55	59	55	60	55	61

The above chart is a comparison of a sampling of Title I schools with a sampling of non-Title I schools in more affluent districts. In both sampling procedures all secondary schools in each district have been included.